UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,247	12/15/2000	Krishna Kishore Yellepeddy	AUS920000947US1	2751

65362 7590 08/05/2009

HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
IBM Austin
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER	
COLIN, CARL G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2433	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tmunoz@hamiltonterrile.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/738,247	YELLEPEDDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CARL COLIN	2433	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 3/31/2009 applicant amends claims 1, 13, 24, 35, and 44, the following claims 1-50 are pending and are presented for examination.

1.1 Applicant's remarks in filed on 3/31/2009 see pages 9-11 with respect to the 101 rejection of the claims are not persuasive. It appears that Applicant is discussing Bilski case which applies to method claim to argue against the apparatus claims. The claimed apparatus do no recite at least one component of the apparatus that is necessarily a computer hardware component. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the 101 rejection remains.

Applicant's remarks, see pages 12-15, filed on 3/31/2009, regarding the prior art rejection have not been persuasive as amended. Applicant argues that French does not disclose "generating a second event object depending on whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction". Examiner respectfully disagrees as claim 1 does not disclose such limitation. In addition, French discloses in paragraph 177 the amended claim limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1- 12 and 35-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising a request implementation software and at least one reception bean which may also be interpreted as software. Claims 35 and 44 recite an apparatus comprising a plurality of beans which may be interpreted as software. Therefore, because none of the elements or features of the claimed apparatus are necessarily implemented in hardware, the claims appear to be directed to an arrangement of software per se. The claims are not directed to a process, a machine, manufacture, nor composition of matter within the meaning of 101 and therefore they are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.1 Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites, *at least one two-way bean, communicatively coupled to the distributed processing system, that generates a second event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction.*

Claim 13 recites, implementing a response in a two-way bean, *where the two-way bean generates a second event object depending on whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction.*

Claim 24 recites, implementing a response at a two-way bean, *depending on whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction at the two-way bean.*

Claim 35 recites, *at least one of the plurality of beans comprising a two-way bean that generates a second event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction.*

Claim 44 recites, *at least one two-way bean, communicatively coupled to the distributed processing system, where the two-way bean generates an event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction.*

Applicant cites paragraph 77. However, the passage provided by applicant does not describe making a determination on whether a request is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction to generate a second event object; nor whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction. Therefore, the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 35-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,502,213 to **Bowman-Amuah**.

As per claim 35, Bowman-Amuah discloses an apparatus for implementing a public key infrastructure in a distributed processing system, the apparatus comprising: the invention is implemented in object request broker services based on COM/DCOM and CORBA and javabeans (see column 104) that meets the recitation of plurality of beans. The components are coupled to each other and able to provide responses to events generated by the plurality of beans (see column 76, lines 1-45) that meets the recitation of a plurality of beans, the beans communicatively coupled to one another and responsive to events generated by the plurality of beans. **Bowman-Amuah** discloses processing pipeline using a plurality of beans acting as filters

wherein at least one of the plurality of beans comprising a pipe bean that propagates an event to another of the plurality of beans (see column 196, line 19 through column 198, line 50). **Bowman-Amuah** discloses a request batcher that generates a second event object based on whether a request is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction see figs. 179-181 with detailed description in columns 296-297 that meets the claimed limitation *at least one of the plurality of beans comprising a two-way bean that generates a second event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction*.

As per claim 36, **Bowman-Amuah** discloses an end of the request structure for providing an output from the request that meets the recitation of the at least one bean comprising a sink bean, the sink bean responsive to propagated events and consuming such propagated events, for example (see column 197, lines 59-65).

As per claim 37, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of wherein the pipe bean passes the event to another bean unaltered, for example (see column 198, lines 35-39).

As per claim 38, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of wherein the pipe bean passes the event to another bean in an altered format (see column 196, lines 19-35).

As per claim 39, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of further comprising a server bean, the server bean responsive to requests from the distributed processing system and generating events (see figures 17-19, 40, 77, 105, and 150-151 with detailed description).

As per claim 40, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of further comprising a client bean, the client bean responsive to events from the other beans and generating requests to the distributed processing system, for example (see figs. 119 and 122-123 with detailed description, disclosing for instance a client bean interacting with many of the components in the distributed processing system).

As per claim 41, Bowman-Amuah discloses public key cryptography generating and publishing public key to user associating with digital certificate that meets the limitation of further comprising a generation bean, the generation bean generating a digital certificate in response to an event, for example (see fig 15, with detailed description and column 80, lines 12-27).

As per claim 42, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of the at least one bean comprising a bean that publishes information regarding the request, for example (see column 32, lines 30-40).

As per claim 43, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of further comprising a filter bean, the filter bean filtering events based upon a predetermined criteria, for example (see column 81, lines 29-33, column 196, lines 19-50 and column 52, lines 35-67).

As per claim 44, Bowman-Amuah discloses an apparatus for implementing a public key infrastructure in a distributed processing system, the apparatus comprising: the invention is implemented in object request broker services based on COM/DCOM and CORBA and javabeans (see column 104) that meets the recitation of plurality of beans. The components are coupled to each other and able to provide responses to events generated by the plurality of beans (see column 76, lines 1-45) that meets the recitation of the beans communicatively coupled to one another and responsive to events generated by the plurality of beans. **Bowman-Amuah** discloses the respective events generated by the plurality of beans subclassing from a base class event, for example (see column 170, lines 1-44). **Bowman-Amuah** discloses a request batcher that generates a second event object based on whether a request is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction see figs. 179-181 with detailed description in columns 296-297 that meets the claimed limitation *at least one of the plurality of beans comprising a two-way bean that generates a second event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction*.

As per claims 45-46, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of wherein the beans and events are written in a cross platform language, the cross platform language is JAVA, for example (see column 104).

As per claim 47, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of wherein the at least one the beans is a publisher bean (see column 32, lines 30-40).

As per claim 48, Bowman-Amuah discloses the limitation of wherein the at least one the beans is generator bean (see fig 15, with detailed description and column 80, lines 12-27).

As per claims 49-50, Bowman-Amuah discloses wherein the at least one the beans is a client bean and at least one of the beans is a server bean (see figures 17-19, 40, 77, 105, and 150-151 with detailed description).

6. **Claims 1-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication US 2001/0001877 to **French et al**.

As per claim 1, French et al discloses an apparatus for implementing a request regarding a digital certificate in a distributed processing system, the apparatus comprising: **French et al** discloses the invention may be implemented in Java which is an object-oriented language (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraph 71) which implicitly or inherently comprises plurality of JavaBeans. **French et al** discloses different components (beans) in the pre-processing stages for performing different stages of authentication (see page 9) provided response to the request regarding the digital certificate (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41) in response to propagated object (i.e. query or result) (see paragraphs 118 and 149, see also paragraphs 66-67) that meets the recitation of *a request implementation software that implements a response to the request regarding the digital certificate in response to a propagated event object;*

French et al discloses *at least one reception bean, communicatively coupled to the request implementation software and the distributed processing system*, (see paragraphs 145-147) *that generates an event object in response to receiving the request to generate a digital certificate from the distributed processing system* (see paragraphs 159-162). See also (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41).

French et al discloses a real-time interactive environment implemented in Java (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraphs 67 and 71) that meets the recitation of *the request implementation software instantiated in a real time executable object-oriented language*.

French et al discloses application server 130 or authentication system as a two-way bean issuing digital certificate or other authentication or asking for more processing (generating a second event object) depending on whether the request is received or the successful authentication of the request is received (see fig. 45 and paragraphs 66, 67, 173, and 177) which meets the claimed limitation *at least one two-way bean, communicatively coupled to the distributed processing system, that generates a second event object depending on whether a request to the two-way bean is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction*.

As per claim 13, **French et al** discloses a method for implementing a request regarding a digital certificate in a distributed processing system, the method comprising: **French et al** discloses the invention may be implemented in Java which is an object-oriented language (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraph 71) which implicitly or inherently comprises plurality of JavaBeans. **French et al** discloses *receiving the request to generate the digital*

certificate from the distributed processing system in at least one reception bean, (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41) (see paragraphs 159-162 also disclosing at least one reception bean).

French et al discloses generating response and propagating the response in response to the step of receiving (see paragraphs 118 and 154, see also paragraphs 66-67) that meets the recitation of *generating a reception event object in response to step of receiving propagating the reception event object* (see paragraphs 159-162).

French et al discloses **French et al** discloses different components (beans) in the pre-processing stages for performing different stages of authentication (see page 9) provided response to the request regarding the digital certificate (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41) in response to propagated object (i.e. query or result) (see paragraphs 118 and 149, see also paragraphs 66-67) that meets the recitation of *selectively implementing a response to the request regarding the digital certificate in response to a propagated event object in a request implementation software*

French et al discloses a real-time interactive environment implemented in Java (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraphs 67 and 71) that meets the recitation of *the request implementation software instantiated in a real time executable object-oriented language.*

French et al discloses application server 130 or authentication system as a two-way bean issuing digital certificate or other authentication or asking for more processing (generating a second event object) depending on whether the request is received or the successful

authentication of the request is received (see fig. 45 and paragraphs 66, 67, 173, and 177) which meets the claimed limitation *where the two-way bean generates a second event object depending on whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction.*

As per claim 24, French et al discloses a computer program product on a computer usable medium comprising: **French et al** discloses the invention may be implemented in Java which is an object-oriented language (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraph 71) which implicitly or inherently comprises plurality of JavaBeans. **French et al** discloses *receiving the request to generate the digital certificate from the distributed processing system in at least one reception bean*, (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41) (see paragraphs 159-162 also disclosing at least one reception bean).

French et al discloses generating response and propagating the response in response to the step of receiving (see paragraphs 118 and 154, see also paragraphs 66-67) that meets the recitation of *generating a reception event object in response to step of receiving propagating the reception event object* (see paragraphs 159-162).

French et al discloses **French et al** discloses different components (beans) in the pre-processing stages for performing different stages of authentication (see page 9) provided response to the request regarding the digital certificate (see pages 1-2 paragraphs 19-20, page 4, paragraphs 66-69, page 9, paragraphs 153-155 and page 11, paragraphs 173-174 and figs. 37-41) in response to propagated object (i.e. query or result) (see paragraphs 118 and 149, see also paragraphs 66-67) that meets the recitation of *selectively implementing a response to the request*

regarding the digital certificate in response to a propagated event object in a request implementation software

French et al discloses a real-time interactive environment implemented in Java (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraphs 67 and 71) that meets the recitation of *the request implementation software instantiated in a real time executable object-oriented language*.

French et al discloses application server 130 or authentication system as a two-way bean issuing digital certificate or other authentication or asking for more processing (generating a second event object) depending on whether the request is received or the successful authentication of the request is received (see fig. 45 and paragraphs 66, 67, 173, and 177) which meets the claimed limitation implementing a response at a two-way bean, *depending on whether the propagated event object is received in a forward flow or reverse flow direction at the two-way bean.*

As per claim 2, French et al discloses at least one reception bean comprising a plurality of reception beans and each of the plurality of reception beans generating an event in response to requests of differing formats (see paragraphs 159-162).

As per claim 3, French et al discloses the invention may be implemented in Java which is an object-oriented language (see page 3, paragraph 62 and page 4, paragraph 71) which implicitly or inherently comprises plurality of JavaBeans that meets the recitation of the request implementation software comprising at least one bean.

As per claim 4, French et al discloses wherein the at least one bean comprising a pipe bean for example (see paragraph 66).

As per claim 5, French et al discloses the at least one bean comprising a bean implementing a test on the request (see paragraph 69).

As per claim 6, French et al discloses the at least one bean comprising a bean that alters the request (see paragraph 162).

As per claim 7, French et al discloses the at least one bean comprising a bean that publishes information regarding the request (see paragraphs 154 and 164).

As per claim 8, French et al discloses wherein the at least one bean comprising at least one sink bean and at least one pipe bean for example (see paragraph 66).

As per claim 9, French et al discloses wherein the at least one bean comprising a sink bean for example (see paragraph 66).

As per claim 10, French et al discloses wherein the at least one bean comprising a client bean that propagates a request in a first format (see paragraph 84).

As per claim 11, French et al discloses wherein the at least one bean comprising another client bean that propagates a request in a second format, for example (see paragraphs 112-116).

As per claim 12, French et al discloses limitation of the certificate generation software comprising a legacy software, for example (see paragraphs 124, 161-163).

As per claims 14-16 and 20-23, these claims recite similar limitations to claims 2-4 and 9-12 respectively except for implementing the claimed apparatus into a method. Therefore, claims 14-16 and 20-23 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-4 and 9-12 above.

As per claim 17, French et al discloses the step of selectively implementing comprising testing a parameter of the request (see paragraph 69).

As per claim 18, French et al discloses the step of selectively implementing comprising testing a parameter of the request (see paragraph 162).

As per claim 19, French et al discloses the step of selectively implementing comprising publishing information regarding the request (see paragraphs 154 and 164).

As per claims 25-34, these claims recite similar limitations to claims 2-7 and 9-12 respectively except for implementing the claimed apparatus into a computer program product.

Therefore, claims 25-34 are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-12 above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARL COLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Carl Colin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2433
August 2, 2009